



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

jm
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,713	03/01/2002	Samir G. Lehaff	00680.P0021	7481
27660	7590	10/04/2004	EXAMINER	
BURGESS & BEREZNAK LLP 800 WEST EL CAMINO REAL SUITE 180 MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94040			RAMPURIA, SHARAD K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2683

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/087,713	LEHAFF ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Sharad Rampuria	2683	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>07/23/02</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Pg. 5; Paragraph [0014] “The mobile communication system 10” and “The conference server 10” should not be same number.

Appropriate correction is required.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because “37 CFR 1.72 (b)”. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-2, 4, 7-14, 21-25, 32-38, & 47-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fickes et al. [US 6526274] (hereinafter Fickes) in view of Miner et al. [US 6047053] (hereinafter Miner).

1. Regarding claim 1, Fickes disclose a method for conducting mobile communications, (abstract) comprising;
providing a server (125; fig.1) coupled to a corporate information system (CIS) in an organization via a first network; (Col.3; 31-44)
providing a plurality of speech terminals (135; fig.1; Col.5; 53-57) coupled to the server through a second network, the speech terminals accessing data in the CIS through voice or digital signals; (Col.3; 31-44 & Col.9; 1-10) and

Fickes fails to disclose an electronic attendant. However, Miner teaches in an analogous art, that distributing calls to the speech terminals using an electronic attendant coupled to the server through the computer network. (10; fig.1; Col.5; 30-39) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include an electronic attendant in order to provide a computer-based assistant to receive and manage incoming calls to a subscriber.

2. Regarding claim 2, Fickes disclose the method of claim 1 wherein the voice signals are recognized through speech recognition technology. (Col.9; 1-10)

4. Regarding claim 4, Fickes disclose the method of claim 1 wherein the second network comprises a public communications network and/or a private communications network. (Col.4; 16-29)

7. Regarding claim 7, Fickes disclose the method of claim 4 further comprising distributing incoming and outgoing calls to the private communications network. (Col.4; 30-50)

8. Regarding claim 8, Fickes disclose the method of claim 4 further comprising distributing incoming and outgoing calls to the public communications network. (Col.4; 30-50)

9. Regarding claim 9, Fickes discloses all the particulars of the claim except a public attendant and a corporate attendant. However, Miner teaches in an analogous art, that the method of claim 1 wherein the electronic attendant is comprised of a public attendant and a corporate attendant. (Col.10; 56-67) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a public attendant and a corporate attendant in order to provide a computer-based assistant to receive and manage incoming calls to a subscriber.

10. Regarding claim 10, Fickes discloses all the particulars of the claim except distributes calls from speech terminals external to the organization. However, Miner teaches in an analogous art,

that the method of claim 9 wherein the public attendant distributes calls from speech terminals external to the organization. (Col.10; 56-67) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include distributes calls from speech terminals external to the organization in order to provide a computer-based assistant to receive and manage incoming calls to a subscriber.

11. Regarding claim 11 Fickes discloses all the particulars of the claim except distributes calls from speech terminals internal to the organization. However, Miner teaches in an analogous art, that the method of claim 9 wherein the corporate attendant distributes calls from speech terminals internal to the organization. (Col.10; 56-67)) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include distributes calls from speech terminals internal to the organization in order to provide a computer-based assistant to receive and manage incoming calls to a subscriber.

12. Regarding claim 12, Fickes disclose the method of claim 1 wherein the speech terminals are attended devices. (Col.3; 31-44)

13. Regarding claim 13, Fickes disclose the method of claim 1 wherein the speech terminals are unattended devices. (email; Col.5; 53-66 & Col.6; 29-48)

14. Regarding claim 14, Fickes disclose the method of claim 1 further comprising accessing one or more parties through a speech terminal using the e-mail address, phone number, or any other form of identification for the one or more parties stored in the CIS. (Col.3; 4-13)

21. Regarding claim 21, Fickes disclose the method of claim 1 wherein the data includes contact information. (Col.3; 4-13)

22. Regarding claim 22, Fickes disclose The method of claim 1 wherein the data includes e-mail messages. (Col.3; 4-13)

23. Regarding claim 23, Fickes disclose The method of claim 1 wherein the data includes address information. (Col.3; 4-13)

24. Regarding claim 24, Fickes disclose The method of claim 1 wherein the data includes calendar and task lists. (Col.3; 4-13)

25. Regarding claim 25, Fickes disclose The method of claim 1 wherein the data includes directory lists. (Col.3; 4-13)

26. Regarding claim 26, Fickes disclose The method of claim 1 wherein the data includes sales force automation information. (Col.3; 45-52)

27. Regarding claim 27, Fickes disclose The method of claim 1 wherein the data includes field force automation information. (Col.3; 45-52)

32. Regarding claim 32, Fickes disclose The method of claim 1 further comprising commanding the server to perform tasks using a speech terminal. (Col.4; 63-Col.5; 4)

33. Regarding claim 33, Fickes disclose The method of claim 32 wherein the tasks include sending and receiving messages. (Col.4; 63-Col.5; 4)

34. Regarding claim 34, Fickes disclose The method of claim 33 wherein the messages are e-mail messages. (Col.5; 53-67)

35. Regarding claim 35, Fickes disclose The method of claim 32 wherein the tasks include forwarding calls. (Col.5; 53-67)

36. Regarding claim 36, Fickes disclose The method of claim 32 wherein the task include conferencing with other parties using the speech terminals. (Col.9; 55-64)

37. Regarding claim 37, Fickes disclose The method of claim 1 further comprising providing a set of responses to a speech terminal, the set of responses dynamically changing depending on the speech terminal. (Col.5; 53-66 & Col.6; 29-48)

Art Unit: 2683

38. Regarding claim 38, Fickes disclose The method of claim 37 wherein the set of the responses to the speech terminal includes a recorded message. (Col.5; 53-66 & Col.6; 29-48)

47. Regarding claim 47, Fickes disclose The method of claim 1 wherein the speech terminals include telephones. (Col.3; 62-67)

48. Regarding claim 48, Fickes disclose The method of claim 1 wherein the speech terminals include personal digital assistants.

49. Regarding claim 49, Fickes disclose The method of claim 1 wherein the speech terminals include computers. (Col.3; 62-67)

Claims 15-17, 31 & 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fickes & Miner further in view of Nykanen et al. [US 6714778] (hereinafter Nykanen).

15. Regarding claim 15, the above combination discloses all the particulars of the claim except user authentication is required to access data. However, Nykanen teaches in an analogous art, that the method of claim 1 wherein user authentication is required to access data in the CIS. (Col.7; 5-24) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include user authentication is required to access data in order to provide improvement in accessing data through internet service.

16. Regarding claim 16, the above combination discloses all the particulars of the claim except user authentication is required to access data. However, Nykanen teaches in an analogous art, that the method of claim 15 wherein the authentication comprises entering a code into a speech terminal. (Col.7; 5-24) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include user authentication is required to access data in order to provide improvement in accessing data through internet service.

17. Regarding claim 17, the above combination discloses all the particulars of the claim except user authentication is required to access data. However, Nykanen teaches in an analogous art, that the method of claim 15 wherein the authentication comprises a matching voice characteristic. (Col.11; 36-41) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include user authentication is required to access data in order to provide improvement in accessing data through internet service.

31. Regarding claim 31, the above combination discloses all the particulars of the claim except the data includes information from databases and web sites on the internet. However, Nykanen teaches in an analogous art, that the method of claim 1 wherein the data includes information from databases and web sites on the internet. (Col.4; 56-67) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the data includes information from databases and web sites on the internet in order to provide improvement in accessing data through internet service.

Art Unit: 2683

50. Regarding claim 50, the above combination discloses all the particulars of the claim except the network is the internet. However, Nykanen teaches in an analogous art, that the method of claim 1 wherein the network is the Internet. (Col.4; 56-67) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the network is the internet in order to provide improvement in accessing data through internet service.

Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fickes & Miner further in view of Singh [US 6405035] (hereinafter Singh).

18. Regarding claim 18, the above combination discloses all the particulars of the claim except dynamically associating a user with a speech terminal using data stored in the CIS. However, Singh teaches in an analogous art, that the method of claim 1 further comprising dynamically associating a user with a speech terminal using data stored in the CIS. (Col.4; 51-Col.5; 8) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include dynamically associating a user with a speech terminal using data stored in the CIS in order to update the message so that repetitive messages are eliminated.

19. Regarding claim 19, the above combination discloses all the particulars of the claim except dynamically associating a user with a speech terminal using data stored in the CIS. However, Singh teaches in an analogous art, that the method of claim 18 further comprising storing the association between the user and the speech terminal as a user profile, the CIS accessing the user profile every time the user logs on to the mobile communication system using the speech

terminal. (Col.4; 51-Col.5; 8) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include dynamically associating a user with a speech terminal using data stored in the CIS in order to update the message so that repetitive messages are eliminated.

20. Regarding claim 20, the above combination discloses all the particulars of the claim except dynamically associating a user with a speech terminal using data stored in the CIS. However, Singh teaches in an analogous art, that the method of claim 1 further comprising updating the data in the CIS using a speech terminal by a user or other users registered in the CIS. (Col.4; 51-Col.5; 8) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include dynamically associating a user with a speech terminal using data stored in the CIS in order to update the message so that repetitive messages are eliminated.

Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fickes & Miner further in view of Takahashi et al. [US 6070081] (hereinafter Takahashi).

5. Regarding claim 5, the above combination discloses all the particulars of the claim except calls from the public communications network to the private communications network. However, Takahashi teaches in an analogous art, that the method of claim 4 further comprising distributing incoming calls from the public communications network to the private communications network. (Col.7; 9-24) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include calls from the public communications network to the private

communications network in order to provide a method for easily communication between private and public mobile telephones.

6. Regarding claim 6, the above combination discloses all the particulars of the claim except calls from the public communications network to the private communications network. However, Takahashi teaches in an analogous art, that the method of claim 4 further comprising distributing outgoing calls from the private communications network to the public communications network. (Col.7; 9-24) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include calls from the public communications network to the private communications network in order to provide a method for easily communication between private and public mobile telephones.

Claims 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fickes & Miner further in view of Stern et al. [US 6731927] (hereinafter Stern).

28. Regarding claim 28, the above combination discloses all the particulars of the claim except the data includes information related to an organization's employees. However, Stern teaches in an analogous art, that The method of claim 1 wherein the data includes information related to an organization's employees. (Col.7; 56-67) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the data includes information related to an organization's employees in order to provide access to an entity by context association.

29. Regarding claim 29, the above combination discloses all the particulars of the claim except the data includes information from data repositories internal to the organization. However, Stern teaches in an analogous art, that The method of claim 28 wherein the data includes information from data repositories internal to the organization. (Col.2; 15-28) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the data includes information from data repositories internal to the organization in order to provide access to an entity by context association.

30. Regarding claim 30, the above combination discloses all the particulars of the claim except the data includes information from data repositories external to the organization. However, Stern teaches in an analogous art, that The method of claim 28 wherein the data includes information from data repositories external to the organization. (Col.2; 15-28) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the data includes information from data repositories external to the organization in order to provide access to an entity by context association.

Claims 3, 39-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fickes & Miner further in view of Evans et al. [US 2004/0002325] (hereinafter Evans).

3. Regarding claim 3, the above combination discloses all the particulars of the claim except the server is a modular appliance. However, Evans teaches in an analogous art, that the method of claim 1 wherein the server is a modular appliance. (7; fig.1; pg.3; 0056) Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the server is a modular appliance in order to provide the communication of multimedia documents from multimedia servers to multimedia clients.

39. Regarding claim 39, the above combination discloses all the particulars of the claim except text-to-speech technology. However, Evans teaches in an analogous art, that The method of claim 37 wherein the set of responses to the speech terminal is an on-the-fly translation of responses into sounds using text-to-speech technology. (pg.2; 0030) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include text-to-speech technology in order to provide the communication of multimedia documents from multimedia servers to multimedia clients.

40. Regarding claim 40, the above combination discloses all the particulars of the claim except multi-modal interfaces. However, Evans teaches in an analogous art, that The method of claim 1 wherein the speech terminals includes multi-modal interfaces. (2; fig.1; pg.1; 0012-0013) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include multi-modal interfaces in order to provide the communication of multimedia documents from multimedia servers to multimedia clients.

41. Regarding claim 41, the above combination discloses all the particulars of the claim except multi-modal interfaces. However, Evans teaches in an analogous art, that The method of claim 40 wherein a user can input information to the server through the multi-modal interfaces using

Art Unit: 2683

text, keystrokes, and speech recognition. (pg.1; 0012-0013) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include multi-modal interfaces in order to provide the communication of multimedia documents from multimedia servers to multimedia clients.

42. Regarding claim 42, the above combination discloses all the particulars of the claim except the multi-modal interfaces. However, Miner teaches in an analogous art, that the method of claim 40 wherein the multi-modal interfaces present information to the server using a combination of sound, text, graphics, and video. (pg.3; 0059) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include multi-modal interfaces in order to provide the communication of multimedia documents from multimedia servers to multimedia clients.

43. Regarding claim 43, the above combination discloses all the particulars of the claim except text-to-speech technology. However, Evans teaches in an analogous art, that The method of claim 42 wherein the sound is generated by text-to-speech technology. (pg.2; 0030) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include text-to-speech technology in order to provide the communication of multimedia documents from multimedia servers to multimedia clients.

44. Regarding claim 44, Fickes disclose all the particulars of the claim except the sound is generated by playing recorded files. However, Miner teaches in an analogous art, that the method

of claim 42 wherein the sound is generated by playing recorded files. (Col.13; 15-25) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the sound is generated by playing recorded files in order to provide a computer-based assistant to receive and manage incoming calls to a subscriber.

45. Regarding claim 45, the above combination discloses all the particulars of the claim except multi-modal interfaces. However, Evans teaches in an analogous art, that the method of claim 42 wherein the sound is generated by a continuous stream of sound data sent to the multi-modal interfaces. (pg.3; 0059) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include multi-modal interfaces in order to provide the communication of multimedia documents from multimedia servers to multimedia clients.

46. Regarding claim 46, the above combination discloses all the particulars of the claim except multi-modal interfaces. However, Evans teaches in an analogous art, that the method of claim 42 wherein the video is generated by a continuous stream of video data sent to the multi-modal interfaces. (pg.3; 0059) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include multi-modal interfaces in order to provide the communication of multimedia documents from multimedia servers to multimedia clients.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharad Rampuria whose telephone number is 703-308-4736. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri. (9:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on 703-308-5318. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

Sharad Rampuria
September 20, 2004


WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600